



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/879,509	06/11/2001	Michael L. Haile	14073	4071	
75	90 04/30/2002				
THEODORE J. BIELEN, JR. Bielen, Lampe & Thoeming			EXAMINER		
			RAJGURU, UMAKANT K		
Suite 720 1990 N. Califor	nia Blvd				
Walnut Creek, CA 94596			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711	h	
		DATE MAILED: 04/30/2002			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

V	3

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	(A 1)	
Office Action Summary				
y	Examiner		Group Art Unit	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover she	et beneath the co	rrespondence address	
Period for Response				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	-3 -month	I(S) FROM THE	
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relative to response is specified above, such period shall, by default - Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by</li> </ul>	esponse within the sta	atutory minimum of thi	rty (30) days will be considered timely	
Status			,	
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
☐ This action is FINAL.			•	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	formal matters, pi D. 11; 453 O.G.	rosecution as to t 213.	he merits is closed in	
Disp sition of Claims				
Claim(s)		is/are ne	ending in the application	
Of the above claim(s)			is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are all	is/are allowed		
© Claim(s) 1-16		is/are rei	exted	
☐ Claim(s)		is/are rej	icated to	
☐ Claim(s)		aro subic	pected to.	
Application Papers		requirem	ent.	
$\square$ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re	eview, PTO-948.			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved	d 🗆 disapproved.		
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	to by the Examine	r.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
<ul> <li>□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under</li> <li>□ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the preceived.</li> <li>□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) □ received in this national stage application from the International Stage application from the Internation from the Internation from the Int</li></ul>	priority documents	have been		
*Certified copies not received:			·	
Attachment(s)				
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	2	Interview Summar	v. PTO-413	
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892			Patent Application, PTO-152	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948				
Office Act	ion Summary			



Art Unit: 1762

1. Claims 1-16 are under examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 is indefinite in containing an improper Markush terminology. The correct format is "selected from the group consisting of" (not consisting essentially of).

Similar remarks apply to claims 6, 7, 14 and 15.

Claims 6 and 14 are additionally vague because it is not specified what "modified polysaccharides" means, which specific modifications of polysaccharides are envisioned.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, J. (USP 6071325).

Schmitt discloses a binder composition and a process for agglomerating particulate material (abstract; col. 2, lines 44-61). Particulate material is mixed with a binding effective amount of a water-soluble polymer and caustic. Water-soluble

since class are cancelled 21,2002

Application/Control Number: 09/879,509

Art Unit: 1762

polymers include starch, guar gum, lignin etc, polyacrylamides, polyacrylates and copolymers thereof (col. 3, line 54 to col. 4, line 7). Amounts of polymer and caustic are set forth in col. 5, lines 29-33. Composition may include polysaccharides (col. 5, lines 47-65).

Schmitt does not mention his invention as being directed to a "tackifier". It is noted that though instant invention is named as a "tackifier", it is directed to a composition which is sprayed on certain area to control (by agglomeration) particulate matter (see specification, page 3, lines 17-20). Schmitt teaches the same objective by his invention. It would therefore have been obvious to follow teachings of Schmitt and arrive at invention as claimed. It is also reasonable to infer that the caustic of Schmitt acts as a crosslinking agent in the said composition.

5. Claims 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, J. (USP 6071325) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Roe et al (USP 4751259) and West et al (USP 5459181)

(West is of record on PTO-1449, Paper No. 2).

Disclosure of Schmitt is presented in short form earlier.

Schmitt does not mention sodium borate, sodium metaborate etc. (of instant claim 7), surfactant (of instant claim 8) and fiber (of instant claim 9).

Roe discloses compositions for iron are agglomeration. Such a composition comprises (a) an emulsion of vinyl addition polymer, (b) a polysaccharide, (c) a surfactant and (d) borax (col. 1, lines 31-40).

Application/Control Number: 09/879,509

Art Unit: 1762

West discloses as hydraulic binder composition (abstract). The composition comprises a polymer, an amine-formaldehyde condensate and a catalyst (col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 7). Also added to the composition are fibers (col. 5, lines 26-47).

Hence, it would have been obvious to add to the composition of Schmitt, borax and surfactant (of Roe), as well as fibers (of West) because (1) borax improves formation of more pellets in the correct size range and also increases dry strength of pellets and (2) fibers impart a high degree of resistance (to wind and erosion) to the composition after it is applied by spraying.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to U. K. Rajguru whose telephone number is (703) 308-3224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (703) 308-2462. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/879,509

Art Unit: 1762

U.K. Rajguru/dh April 19, 2002

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700